

REMARKS

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-8, 11-16, 19-21, 23-24, 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al (US Patent No. 6,518,962 B2) in view of Eaton et al. (US Patent No. 5,157,525). The Examiner states Kimura et al teaches an organic light-emitting diode (OLED) display system having addressable pixels on a substrate, the pixels having performance attributes, and a control circuit for controlling the pixels of the display device (See Col. 1, Lines 9-22), comprising: a) one or more OLED pixels (See Fig. 1, item 10, Col. 20, Lines 26-40); b) an OLED pixel located on a substrate (See Fig. 1, item 1, Col. 20, Lines 9-15) and connected to the control circuit (See from Col. 2, Line 63 to Col. 3, Line 3), the OLED pixel having a voltage sensing circuit including a transistor connected to one of the terminals of the OLED pixel for sensing the voltage across the OLED pixel to produce a voltage signal representing the voltage across the OLED pixel (See Fig. 11, items 224,231, Col. 21, Lines 40-52); c) a measurement circuit connected to the voltage signal to produce an output signal representative of the performance attributes of the OLED pixel (See Fig. 3, items 13,16, Col. 21, Lines 53-55); d) an analysis circuit (in the reference is equivalent to comparison circuit) connected to the measurement circuit to receive the output signal, compare the performance attributes with predetermined performance attributes, and produce a feedback signal in response thereto (See Fig. 3, item 21 a, Col. 21, Lines 58-63); and e) the control circuit being responsive to the feedback signal to compensate for changes in the output of the OLED pixels (See Fig. 3, item 22a, from Col. 21, Line 63 to Col. 22, Line 6). The Examiner further states that Eaton et al. teaches LCD reference pixel having the same performance attributes as the one or more LCD pixels (See Fig. 1, item 1, Col. 2, Lines 28-31), and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate Eaton et al. teaching into Kimura et al. system in order to allow pre-selected optical properties to be maintained even if there are changes in temperature or aging (See Col. 1, Lines 57-62 in the Eaton et al. reference). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Fig. 11, items 224,231, and Col. 21, Lines 40-52 of Kimura et al does not teach or disclose OLED pixels having a voltage sensing circuit including a transistor connected to one of the

terminals of the OLED pixel for sensing the voltage across the OLED pixel to produce a voltage signal representing the voltage across the OLED pixel. To the contrary, such cited passage of Kimura et al (col. 21, lines 40-52) discloses a current measuring system 16, and a voltage control circuit 22a. Rather than sense voltage across an OLED, voltage control circuit 22a adjusts the output voltage of common electrode driving circuit 13. If the Examiner intended to reference col. 27, lines 40-52 (which is associated with the referenced Fig. 11), this passage also fails to describe any voltage sensing circuit which produces a voltage signal representing the voltage across the OLED pixel. Rather, a TFT 231 is simply employed with each EL device 224 to compensate for increases in resistance in the associated EL device 224. Further, while Kimura et al is directed towards self-emitting electroluminescent light-emitting element type displays, Eaton is directed towards LCD type displays. LCD displays do not employ self-emitting individually controlled light emitting elements, but rather employ a common backlight, and there is no teaching, suggestion or explanation of how the LCD reference pixel of Eaton, which measures actual average transmissivity of light from the backlight through the LCD reference pixel, should be incorporated into a self-emitting electroluminescent display. Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion to combine Kimura et al and Eaton et al as proposed by the Examiner, and even if such combination were to be made, it would not result in the claimed invention based on the differences between the actual teaching of Kimura et al relative to that alleged by the Examiner. Accordingly, a prima facie case of obviousness has clearly not been established, and reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.


Claims 3, 9-10, 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al. and Eaton et al, as applied to claims 1, 19 above, and further in view of Stapleton et al. (US Patent No. 5,019,807). Claims 6, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al. and Eaton et al. as applied to claims 5, 19 above, and further in view of Sokolick et al. (US Patent No. 6,608,439 B1). Claims 17, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al. and Eaton et al. as applied to claims 1, 19 above, and further in view of Soules (US Patent No. 6,423,900 B1). Claims 18, 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et

al. and Eaton et al. as applied to claims 1, 19 above, and further in view of Troutman (US Patent No. 6,157,356).

As none of the additionally cited references overcome the basic deficiencies of the primary Kimura et al and Eaton et al references with respect to the present claimed invention, it is respectfully urged that each of claims 1-34 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above, and reconsideration of these references is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested. A prompt and favorable action by the Examiner is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe any remaining issues may be resolved via a telephone interview, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' representative at the number below to discuss such issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 33,564

Andrew J. Anderson/vjr
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: (585) 722-9662
Facsimile: (585) 477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.